

Amendments to the Drawings

One sheet of replacement formal drawings is provided for Figures 1-3, 4a-4b and 5. Figure 1 is now identified as "Prior Art" and the legend "FIG 2" has been added next to Figure 2 to more clearly identify it. No new matter has been added.

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 4-11 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 10 and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 4-11 are sought to be amended. Claims 2-3 and 12-15 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute similar or broader claims, with respect to the cancelled and amended claims, in the future.

The Specification is sought to be amended as shown above.

The Figures are sought to be amended as discussed above, and attached hereto.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification was object to for not having optional headings. Although Applicant finds no requirement for headings in the M.P.E.P., Applicant has amended the specification to include section headings, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.77(b), in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 4-9 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being in improper form because multiple dependent claims cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Without acquiescing to the objection, Claims 4-9 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Objections to the Drawings

Figure 1 was objected to because the Examiner alleges it illustrates only that which is old and is not designated as prior art. Applicant has submitted replacement drawings to include the designation "Prior Art" in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 608.02(g).

Also, Applicant has amended Figure 2 to include a designation "FIG 2" to more clearly identify Figure 2.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has cancelled these claims for other reasons, and in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant believes this rejection has been rendered moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,558,794 to Jansens (hereinafter "Jansens"). Applicant respectively traverses.

With regards to claims 2-3 and 12, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has cancelled these claims for other reasons, and in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant believes the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot.

Claims 1, 8, 10, and 11 recite features that distinguish over the applied reference. Although claim 8 was not stated in the rejection, Applicant believes it is appropriate to discuss claim 8 herein. For example, claims 1, 8, 10, and 11 recite, using respective language, a heating element extending longitudinally along the cable, wherein the heating element comprises a semi-conductor having a positive temperature coefficient.

Jansens only teaches or suggests using metallic heating elements. Nowhere is the use of a semi-conductor as the heating element, or as part of a heating element, as recited in claims 1, 8, 10, and 11, taught or suggested in Jansens. Even where Jansens discloses long lists of materials that may be used to form the heating element (referred to as the "central strand") at column 1, lines 50 to 52, only metallic materials are mentioned. Thus, a skilled artisan, upon reading Jansens, would never be lead to believe Jansens contemplated using a semi-conductor as a heating element, or as part of a heating element, as recited in claims 1, 8, 10, and 11, nor is the applied reference directed towards anything other than metallic elements. Therefore, Jansens cannot anticipate the pending claims.

Since Jansens does not disclose all of features of claims 1, 8, 10, and 11, Applicant submits that claims 1, 8, 10, and 11 are novel in light of Jansens. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection, and find the pending claims allowable over the applied reference.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Donald J. Featherstone
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,876

Date: May 21, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600